



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/521,235	03/08/2000	KISHORE S SWAMINATHAN	AND1P535	1907

28164 7590 04/08/2005
ACCENTURE CHICAGO 28164
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P O BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/521,235

Applicant(s)

SWAMINATHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/07/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 10/19/2004 to the original application filed 03/08/2000; IDS filed 03/07/2005.
2. Claims 1-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent claims.

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **de l'Etraz et al.**

(U.S. 6,324,541 – filed 06/2000, continuation of application No. 09/245,759 – filed 02/1999), as previously cited.

As to independent claim 1:

de l'Etraz teaches a computer-implemented method for developing a dossier (*e.g., folder; col.17, table 2 & col.20, lines 48-52 and Fig.7*), comprising the steps of:

- (i) receiving into the computer a name of a client (*e.g., receiving an organization and/or person's name input; col.3, lines 47-55 / allows a user to directly input into the PC 106 their private contact information; col.15, lines 24-26*);
- (ii) presenting on a computer-user interface a list consisting of industries associated with the client (*e.g., a graphical representation of the relational patterns between the user and the entities 'though the persons associated with those entities'; col.3, lines 41-63 and col.5, lines 43-60*);
- (ii) allowing selection of an industry from the list of industries (*e.g., the CIDM tool may accept data input to populate the private database 104 directly from several of the commercially available contact manger software application ...provide a GUI push-button or radio button in each of the above name contact manager software applications; col.15, lines 24-52*);
- (iii) searching in a plurality of computer-readable knowledge repositories for information relating to the client and the selected industry (*e.g., searching the public and/or private databases for associations between the user and the organization and/or person; col.3, lines 47-55 and col.15, lines 53-64*); and
- (iv) preparing the dossier utilizing the information found during the searching (*e.g., there are two subfolders folders available to the user for browsing; col.22, lines 44-55 and Fig.19*).

As to dependent claim 2:

de l'Etraz teaches presenting an alternate list consisting of industries not associated with the client (*e.g., database system and services have traditionally deleted and removed*

person's name from their database as these persons become disassociated with a company board; col.17, lines 13-21).

As to dependent claim 3:

de l'Etraz teaches displaying topics associated with the client (*e.g., a contact pathway may be displayed as a node diagram where the nodes denote organizations and the links denote the people that form the associations between the nodes; col.18, lines 18-22 and Fig.25B*) and allowing selection of at least one of the topics for insertion of information relating to the selected at least one of the topics in the dossier (*e.g., folder 'Organization' ...the user clicks on one of them, the information on how he has this access appears; col.20, lines 18-24*).

As to dependent claim 4:

de l'Etraz teaches the dossier is arranged in sections according to people, documents, and projects (*e.g., folders – People, Organizations, and Employees; col.20, lines 47-52 and Figs.4-24*).

As to dependent claim 5:

de l'Etraz teaches the people section is arranged according to the number of documents (*col.23, lines 40-48*) and projects an individual has produced related to the client or industry (*col.23, lines 50-56*).

As to dependent claim 6:

de l'Etraz teaches the documents and projects sections are arranged chronologically (*Fig.19*).

As to independent claim 7:

It is directed to a computer program for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 8:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 9-12:

They include the same limitations as in claims 3-6, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 13:

It is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 14:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 15-18:

They include the same limitations as in claims 3-6, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 19:

de l'Etraz teaches searching for information relating to the at least one of the selected topics, and displaying the information related to the at least one of the selected topics (*e.g., browse and establish the contacts of their contacts and display the optimal relationship path to reach other desired contacts; col.9, lines 51-55*).

As to dependent claim 20:

de l'Etraz teaches arranged sections include displayed expanded node and subnodes (*e.g.*, in Figs.4-24 are implemented using the WindowTM 95/98 tree hierarchy of expandable; col.18, lines 6-11).

As to dependent claim 21:

de l'Etraz teaches the list of associated industries is presented in response to receiving the name of the client (*col.23, lines 40-48*).

As to dependent claim 22:

de l'Etraz teaches storing the association of one or more industries with the name of the client (*e.g.*, a relationships between an organization and a person; col.14, lines 26-42 and Fig.3).

As to dependent claims 23- 24:

They include the same limitations as in claim 22-23, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/20/2004 have been fully considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

de l'Etraz et al.

U.S. Patent No. 6,073,138

issued: Jun. 6, 2000

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
March 23, 2005


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER